


The Ironic Rehabilitation of Hitler



BY AUSTIN J. APP, PH.D.

IT'S AN IRONIC PHENOMENON that people who most hate Hitler keep doing the most to rehabilitate him. They do this by comparing some of the finest Conservative Americans to this Napoleon of German history, one of whom had always been represented as the beast of Paris and the other as the beast of Berlin!

Obviously and ironically, comparing an American whom millions of Americans know to be a fine fellow to Hitler, while it is intended to smear the American, ends up rehabilitating Hitler!

The last presidential campaign provides some instances. One of the best liked Americans would seem to be George C. Wallace. So esteemed is he that the citizens of his state, good Americans all, who know Wallace well, several times overwhelmingly elected him as their governor.

But not only did the citizens of his own state consider him such a fine statesman as to want him for governor as long as they could, but almost ten million voters all across the country wanted him to be the President of the whole United States. They had heard him personally or seen him on television. They had read about him. And, they found him so noble an American as to want him for President.

Now along comes a widely read, though ill-reputed columnist and suggests that Wallace is another Hitler! Using Europe as protective springboard, Drew Pearson lamented:

"There is definitely widespread alarm over George Wallace. Europeans fear that the United States is developing a Hitler. Having seen Hitler close up, Wallace's grandstanding sends shivers up their spinal columns." (San Antonio *Express*, Oct. 17, 1968).

But ten million Americans who have seen Wallace close up, rushed out to vote for him. Reading Pearson's smear, they must have concluded that if Hitler close-up was like Wallace, then maybe he wasn't so bad after all! That the comparison was not so much Europe's idea as columnist Pearson's appears from his comment the day before (*San Antonio Express*, Oct. 16, 1968). Just as he later accused Nixon of having "psychiatric problems," so he earlier accused Wallace of the like. He wrote,

"...this psychoneurosis is something which he shares with the late Huey Long, would-be dictator of Louisiana, with Adolf Hitler and with other men who tried to climb to power on the backs of their countrymen."

Now of course, Nixon and Humphrey, and every candidate in a democracy, who seeks votes, tries to "climb to power on the backs" of his countrymen! What can American voters conclude but that if Hitler only did what Wallace, and Nixon, and Humphrey were trying to do he might not have been so totalitarian at all! But really quite in the tradition of democratic elections!

Of course Drew Pearson is not the only one who tried to smear Wallace by comparing him to Hitler. *Time* (Oct. 11, 1968) reported that though Wallace "continued to draw big crowds," presumably of honest Americans who respected him, there were everywhere a minority of "hecklers, brandishing such signs as, 'If You Liked Hitler, You'll Love Wallace.'" *The Wall Street Journal* (Sept. 17, 1968) reported "a tumultuous rally in Milwaukee." We read:

"...a racially mixed group led by white civil rights activist Father James Groppi arrived in the hall chanting, 'Hey, hey, Uncle Sam, Hitler's in Alabama,' and '2-4-6-8, Wallace wants a fascist state.'"

Here Wallace, the choice of nearly ten million democratic Americans, was not only compared to Hitler but had fascism imputed to him. It seems to be customary with communists and radicals

and liberals to call anyone who wants law, order, and decency a fascist. They have frequently called the Pope so, for example. A particular instance of this occurs in *Morgenthau's Diary*. When Morgenthau pushed his plan to dismember Germany, flood its mines, and pastuerize it, Stimson said it would exterminate thirty million Germans. He and Hull of the State Department opposed the intended monster genocide. This infuriated Morgenthau. He exploded:

"They tried to get [Roosevelt] to change, and they couldn't—the State Department crowd. Sooner or later the President just has to clean house, I mean the vicious crowd... And they are for Herbert Hoover, and Herbert Hoover gets us in this mess, and they are Fascists at heart..." (See Vol. I, p. 61).

So there we have the top Morgenthauist call honorable men in the government who oppose mass genocide, mass starvation for the vanquished, *fascists*! And people of a like mentality would naturally, not only compare Wallace to Hitler, but also call him a fascist! That type of liberal could go so far as the columnist "TRB" in the *New Republic* (August 17, 1968) who characterized the Republican platform "as one that 'Lincoln or Hitler could both have run on'" (*National Review*, Sept. 10, 1968)!

But getting back to Wallace, one Frank Getlein in "Charisma Bad News in Democracy" (*Washington Star*, Nov. 6, 1968) deplored that Wallace "demonstrated beyond all possible doubt that a presidential candidate can have charisma and still be bad news.... The Germans experienced Hitler and his charisma, the Italians Mussolini and his." Since ten million Americans considered Wallace the best man for the presidency of this great Republic, how will they revise their image of Hitler when they learn that he had a charisma like Wallace!

Wallace is not the only great American Conservative who has been pejora-

tively compared to Hitler. What smear-terrorizing such a comparison spewed out by communists, radicals and liberals constitutes appears from Thomas Char-michael's characterization of Hitler. This assistant to the managing editor of *Life*, in a review of Cornelius Ryan's *The Last Battle* (April 1, 1966) wrote,

"But without the Heinrichs and other willing professionals of the Wehrmacht, Hitler would never have conquered Europe and would not have become history's greatest mass murderer and the biggest monstrosity to lead a modern state."

Despite such a monstrous opinion of Hitler, or perhaps because of it, communists and liberals evidence a satanic compulsion to liken anti-communistic Americans to him. Even Barry Goldwater, surely one of the most beloved of American Conservatives and anti-Communists, did not escape. Not even his being ethnically Jewish on his father's side caused him to be spared. After the Republican convention in 1964 had enthusiastically nominated him, the Reds and liberals opened up on him somewhat like the Pharisees opened up on Jesus of Nazareth between Palm Sunday and Maundy Thursday. The important German-language Jewish paper, *Aufbau*, New York, wrote of "Goldwater's *Mein Kampf*" and accused him of sympathy with "German Rightist and NeoNazi circles." The leftist magazine *American Dialog* (October-November, 1964) in an editorial "Memo to Barry," wrote:

"Racists are the natural allies, blood-brother kin to the neo-fascists clustered around Goldwater . . . Certainly the brutalities in the South and elsewhere bring the Third Reich to mind . . . The pretext of anti-Communism was the lever that pried Germany into the Third Reich . . . When the German Goldwaters took over . . . fascism made no nice distinctions between liberals, trade-unionists, socialists, true Christians, Communists . . . The demogogy of Hitler managed that . . ."

In the nasty campaign against Goldwater, the nastiest editorial in what had been until then considered a top respectable magazine was in the *Saturday Evening Post* (Sept. 19, 1964). In it they did, it is true, not directly compare Goldwater to Hitler, but they did so obliquely. They wrote:

"Goldwater is a grotesque burlesque of the conservative he pretends to be. He is a wild man, a stray, an unprincipled and ruthless political jujitsu artist like Joe McCarthy."

The Post speaks of "his strange love affair with German prowess," quotes his having said, "I think it was the Germans who originated the modern concept of peace through strength," and then gets in its oblique comparison of Goldwater to Hitler:

"This last remark prompted Hamilton Fish Armstrong, editor of *Foreign Affairs*, to ask *The New York Times* to clarify whether it was Hitler's or the Kaiser's 'peace through strength' that Goldwater had in mind."

Barry Goldwater, whom the *Post* thus obliquely compared to Hitler, is one of the most beloved and respected of Americans. Over thirty-seven millions wanted him as their president, and his own Arizonians just re-elected him to the Senate. Though the smear-terrorists intended only to hurt Goldwater, comparing him to Hitler could only make people think less ill of Hitler.

Since Senator Joseph McCarthy is an aggressive anti-communist, he could be expected to be slandered as another Hitler. The *Post's* swipe at him is typical. Harry Golden, editor of *The Caroline Israelite*, which billed itself as "the most widely quoted personal journal in the world," often sniped at McCarthy. Once when criticized for this, he took refuge behind the Catholicism of his wife and sons to smear him as follows:

"My wife and three sons are Catholics and they always looked upon Joe McCarthy as a cheap, alcoholic, em-

bryonic Hitler." (See *Wanderer*, Jan. 13, 1966.)

The voters of Wisconsin, however, who knew McCarthy best, twice elected him to the Senate, giving the lie to the Red smear campaign. And during the last few years on one Saturday in April, in St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York, Catholics and other patriotic Americans revere his memory at a Latin High Mass. To compare such a man to Hitler can only be complimentary to the latter!

Another notable congressional anti-communist, like Joseph McCarthy, was Martin Dies, founder of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. In spite of fact that millions of Texans and others knew him to be a decent, patriotic American, Communists and liberals managed to compare him to Hitler. Adam Clayton Powell, for example, whom his congressional colleagues considered too disreputable to remain in Congress, once calumniated him as follows:

"The sooner he is buried, the better. He is one of the few people in history whose body has begun to stink before it died . . . There is only one place fit for him to live and that's Hitler's out-house. The death of Dies is just as important as the death of Hitler." (See *Cross and Flag*, May, 1967).

Out of the mouth of a Communist-fronter like this, such a comparison of a patriotic American to Hitler only elevates Hitler. It is ironic that leftists and liberals do not realize this!

Most Californians, for example, and millions of other Americans, considered the late William Parker, police chief of Los Angeles, one of the best in the country. When James Bacon and Bill Boyarsky conducted a survey in the riot area of Los Angeles, among the replies they got was this one: "Parker is the Hitler of Los Angeles. He runs the Police Department like Hitler ran the Gestapo." (The *Herald of Freedom*, Sept. 10, 1965).

It is only a step from calling patriotic

anti-Communists Hitlers to calling Uncle Sam so when he opposes the Communist world conspiracy. According to Holmes Alexander (*Boston Herald*, Nov. 11, 1965), "At the University of Oregon teach-in, Prof. Kenneth Boulding called the United States a 'bandit' in Southeast Asia, Prof. David Aberle of Michigan State accused us in familiar words of 'capitalist imperialism,' and another faculty member compared Uncle Sam to Hitler." According to *National Review*, (Jan. 10, 1967):

"Prof. Frederic Schuman of Williams: 'In systematic *Schrecklichkeit* [terribleness] and genocide, the U.S. aggressive war in Vietnam is without precedent since Hitler's Reich."

Naturally such comparisons of Uncle Sam to Hitler are welcomed by foreign Communists — and re-echoed. In Hanoi's message to Pope Paul VI (Dec. 29, 1965), Ho Chi Minh said:

"The crimes of the U.S. imperialists, comparable with those of Hitler, have aroused profound indignation among the peace-and-justice loving mankind."

The Reader's Digest, in "We Help Communists Win the Propaganda War" (November, 1966) reports:

"A favorite tactic in the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe is to compare President Johnson and the United States with what the people of that area still remember with most fear and contempt: Hitler and Nazi Germany. 'Barbarism in Hitlerite Style,' headlines shrill in 'reporting' U.S. bombing of oil depots near Hanoi and Haiphong. 'The spiritual successors of the Fuhrer,' editorials say."

Homegrown liberals like Pearson and Powell and Golden, who compare patriotic anti-communists to Hitler are therefore in the powerful company of the whole Communistic world conspiracy, which includes Uncle Sam in the same smear tactic. Ironically, however, in the process they rehabilitate Hitler more than they hurt persons or symbols like Wallace, Goldwater, Joe McCarthy — and Uncle Sam!